

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Revision of the Commission's Rules)	CC Docket No. 94-102
to Ensure Compatibility)	
with Enhanced 911 Emergency)	
Calling Systems)	

To: Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

REPLY COMMENTS OF THE TEXAS 9-1-1 AGENCIES

The Texas 9-1-1 Agencies file these brief reply comments to the initial comments filed in response to the July 10, 2001, Public Notice.¹ Opponents² of the Bureau's July 10, 2001, Public Notice simply again make the same or similar legal and procedural arguments that were made in their comments to the April 5, 2001, Public Notice.³ The Texas 9-1-1 Agencies, therefore, will not reply to those initial comments.

The initial comments of the Cellular Telecommunications & Internet Association (CTIA), however, raise an issue that deserves further comment and FCC attention. CTIA argues for the adoption of three different certification requirements that a PSAP must

¹ Public Notice, "Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Seeks Further Comment on the Commission's Rules Concerning Public Safety Answering Point Requests for Phase II Enhanced 911," CC Docket No. 94-102, DA 01-1623 (July 10, 2001)(Public Notice).

² See Comments of Cingular at p. 4.

³ Public Notice, "Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Seeks Comment on Request for Clarification or Declaratory Ruling Concerning Public Safety Answering Point Requests for Phase II Enhanced 911," CC Docket No. 94-102, DA 01-886 (April 5, 2001)(Public Notice).

make at the time of its request for wireless E9-1-1 Phase II service before the request is considered “valid.”⁴ Related to its proposed first requirement, CTIA explains:

First, the PSAP must certify that its ALI database meets the J-STD-036 E2 interface standard or if the PSAP’s ALI vendor is unable to provide E2 interface, the PSAP can provide details supporting an interim solution. Since the PSAP is responsible for all necessary upgrades to the ALI database and selective routers and is the customer of the ALI database, it is essential that the PSAP provide adequate assurances to wireless carriers that the appropriate interface is in place.⁵

The Texas 9-1-1 Agencies agree with CTIA on the importance of assuring that the LEC serving as the ALI database provider will have permanent or interim E2 interface solutions. The Texas 9-1-1 Agencies, however, do not believe that having hundreds of public safety entities seeking to provide that assurance to wireless carriers is the most efficient approach to the issue. This is especially true given the small number of LEC ALI database providers and the much larger number of public safety entities.

The Texas 9-1-1 Agencies believe that the much more efficient process is for the FCC to take the lead in assessing LEC readiness for the LEC’s part in implementing wireless E9-1-1 Phase II service (perhaps in coordination with state public utility commissions). Accordingly, the Texas 9-1-1 Agencies respectfully again urge the FCC to take an active role in assessing LEC readiness for wireless E9-1-1 Phase II service, including the E2 interface issue.

The Texas 9-1-1 Agencies further are concerned about the potential implications of this requirement. As CTIA explains, “[w]e are not aware of any ALI vendor that has incorporated the ability to accept and forward this information into a currently available

⁴ Comments of CTIA at p. 2.

⁵ Comments of CTIA at p. 4.

ALI database service, even though the wireless industry has operated along that development path.”⁶ The Texas 9-1-1 Agencies cannot agree that this is a true statement, and, moreover, this requirement alone would appear to delay indefinitely the implementation of Phase II E911 service absent action by the LEC ALI vendor.

CTIA’s additional condition two appears to mix issues and injects potential ambiguity that must be clarified before it can be considered fully or commented on by interested parties. CTIA proposes, in part, that “the PSAP’s CPE must be certified to either be able to utilize the latitude, longitude, and confidence level data”⁷ In justifying this additional condition, CTIA states, “Furthermore, as a result of differences between the display of NCAS data and the display of hybrid CAS, quality of service and training issues often arise.”⁸ However, CTIA’s own comments on this issue appear to conflict about whether or not this is a CPE issue or an ALI database issue. Compare CTIA Attachment 2 at page 3, first paragraph on the page (involving the ALI database) with the next to last paragraph in the page (involving CPE). The Texas 9-1-1 Agencies respectfully submit that more information is needed on this issue.

CTIA’s additional condition three similarly requires further explanation and clarification. CTIA states, “[T]he PSAP is able to provide the data necessary to support Phase II deployment.”⁹ CTIA’s explanation of this key condition¹⁰ provides little indication of what “data [is] necessary to support Phase II deployment.” While the Texas 9-1-1 Agencies ultimately may have no issue with such a requirement or with providing

⁶ Comments of CTIA at Attachment 2, p. 2.

⁷ *Id.* at p. 2.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ Comments of CTIA at p. 2.

¹⁰ *See* Comments of CTIA at p. 5.

data requested for wireless Phase II deployment, at this time a more detailed explanation of this “condition” is needed before it can determine if it is fully reasonable requisite.

CONCLUSION

The Texas 9-1-1 Agencies reiterate their request that the Bureau ensure that any criteria be identifiable and measurable and not serve to delay the implementation of Phase II E911 service.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard M. Muscat
State Bar No. 14741550

Attorneys for the Texas 911 Agencies

The González Law Firm
One Westlake Plaza
1705 South Capitol of Texas Highway
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 330-9696
(512) 330-9898 (FAX)
pacolaw@msn.com

Certificate of Service

I certify that a copy of these comments is being served on August 1, 2001, by regular or overnight mail or fax on the required parties.

Rupaco T. González, Jr.